

SENATE MINUTES — meeting of February 1	32
SENATE MINUTES — meeting of February 5	34
ACADEMIC ANNOUNCEMENTS	38
SENATE REPORT — meeting of February 19	39
STATEMENT ON THE ISSUES	39

Senate minutes

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1969, AT 9:00 A.M. IN THE COUNCIL OF THE LEACOCK BUILDING

114. REASONS FOR SPECIAL MEETING

The Principal said that in view of the great public interest in this meeting, arrangements had been made to show the proceedings by closed-circuit television in the Physical Sciences Centre Auditorium, and Senate expressed its concurrence with this arrangement.

The Principal then presented the following statement:

[Carried in the February 3 issue of the *McGill Reporter*]

At the conclusion of this statement, the Principal invited Senate to debate the issue.

115. MOTION TO ADOPT HYMAN AGENDA

Mr. Hyman said that in his opinion causes of the disruptions mentioned by the Principal had been the refusal by Senate and the Board of Governors to discuss University business. He then MOVED, seconded by Mr. Hajaly, that Senate adopt the following as its agenda for the day's meeting:

1. Recommendations to the Board of Governors;
2. The method of appointing Deans and the openness of meetings; and
3. Resumption of the regular agenda.

Mr. Hyman said that refusal to adopt this agenda would be an action to disrupt University business.

Professor Metrakos said that this motion was out of order. He pointed out that a special meeting could deal only with the subject stipulated in the notice of meeting. He added that there was no doubt that disruption had been committed, and he proposed that debate on this particular point be limited to thirty minutes.

Mr. Grey said that he did not favour adoption of a strict agenda. He said he felt that the general problem should be discussed, and he favoured the general debate as proposed by the Principal.

Professor Malloch said that he disagreed both with the Principal and with Mr. Hyman because both assumed that Senate was capable of carrying on with an agenda. The disruption in question, however, in-

cluded Senate's failure to deal with its agenda. The report of the Joint Committee on University Government had not proposed how the University should deal with its business, and he felt that a reconsideration of the whole process was needed. He detailed the events concerning proposals on the appointment of Deans, and pointed out that so much time had been lost that it was now impossible to appoint Deans from outside the University. He said he felt that the solution lay in the decision reached at the last meeting for Senate to discuss its own competence. He proposed that disruption should be considered in the total sense he had suggested, adding that he was personally opposed to the disruption of the meeting of the Board of Governors.

Professor Johnston said that the motion was out of order, and MOVED as an amendment to the motion that Senate discussion be confined to the one point for which this special meeting had been called.

A procedural discussion followed, in which Professor Noumoff, Professor Yaffe, Mr. Brown, Mr. Grey, and Professor Hitschfeld took part. Vice-Principal Oliver pointed out that the motion had been to adopt an agenda and that the amendment, since it proposed a change in this agenda, was quite legitimate.

Mr. Edel said that the special meeting itself was illegal since three clear days of notice had not been given. (Note by the Secretary: three clear days of notice had in fact been given). The student demands, Mr. Edel went on to say, concerned substantive needs, such as housing, relations to society, etc. He said he felt that Mr. Hyman's motion was constructive and that the University should take positive stands on substantive matters.

Professor Johnston then clarified his amendment of the motion to say that the wording of Mr. Hyman's motion be altered to confine the agenda to consideration of the single point of disruption of University business, instead of the three points proposed by Mr. Hyman.

The Principal ruled that both the original motion, and the amendment to the motion, were legal.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, with seven members dissenting.

The main motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried, with seven members dissenting.

116. IS DISRUPTION JUSTIFIED?

Professor Bates posed the question, through the Chair, to Mr. Hyman, as to whether he believed that the willful breaking up of a normal meeting was justified.

Mr. Hyman replied that the refusal of Senate and the Board of Governors to consider such matters of University business as the teachers' contract negotiations, proposals concerning the Faculty of Management, and other student proposals, constituted disruption itself of University business, and the students had only reacted to this disruption.

Mr. Hajaly spoke further to this point, saying he believed that the disruptions had not only been justified but had been made necessary by the University's lack of action in the past few months. He said he believed that disruption could be used legitimately to inform a community when its governing bodies

were no longer dealing with the business of the community. Mr. Hajaly then reviewed the sequence of events concerning action on proposals concerning Quebec education, the appointment of Deans, housing, and the composition of the Board of Governors, saying that these were four items of immediate importance. In each case, he said, the governing bodies had not dealt with these matters and hence had failed to come to terms with substantial needs. The Principal asked Professor Bates whether he had received an answer to his question, and Professor Bates said that Mr. Hajaly had shown some of the heat generating the question but had not answered the specific question as to whether disruption was justified under any circumstances.

On a point of order, Mr. Hyman said that no Senator was under any obligation to submit to cross-examination. Professor Bates said that if the question could not be answered Senate could then draw its own conclusions.

Mr. Hajaly resumed his outline of events concerning student proposals. Proposals concerning the selection of Deans had not been considered, and only referred to a committee which had not yet been constituted. The requests of undergraduate societies in this regard had also been ignored. The Nominating Committee, he said, had been ready to proceed with the appointments of Deans committees without revising the procedures. He said that great dissatisfaction was felt with present Deans and their possible re-appointment; and that there was now no time left to consider outside candidates. This situation had led to the disruption of the meeting of the Nominating Committee.

Mr. Hajaly went on to say that student proposals concerning the composition of the Board of Governors had been ignored. The Governors, he said, no longer occupied a position of moral legitimacy. No single item proposed by students had been on the last agenda. On the Board there was a lack of student representation, a lack of response and a lack of ability. Senate too, he added, had not met the needs of society or the students. The Board of Governors should be changed or abolished, and Senate itself should be changed. For these reasons, he said the reaction by the students had been justifiable and necessary. In response to a question from the Principal, Mr. Hajaly said that the answer to the question posed by Professor Bates was 'yes', that disruption was justified.

Mr. Grey spoke on the subject of whether disruption was ever justified, citing various historical examples. In general he felt that disruption was only justified if the group taking action knew that nothing else could be done and that the opposing group was wrong. He reviewed the history of the student movement in North America, saying that the revolutionary group at McGill was a small unit, and that the majority of students did not support disruption. The majority of students, he felt, did not have confidence in this revolutionary group and did not feel that violence was justified. He said he believed that the new Code of Sanctions would have to make provision for dealing with such actions. He said he agreed, however, that the Board of Governors should be abolished or democratized, and that such matters as secret research,

ITEMS FOR THE GAZETTE

The GAZETTE is published weekly throughout the academic year. Deadline for submitting items for publication is Monday of the week prior to the week of publication. Materials for the GAZETTE should be forwarded to the Editor, Harry E. Thomas, Rm. 630, Administration Building.

the improvement of teaching methods, etc. needed urgent attention.

Professor Vogel made the point that the University had become a political beast, and that it was no longer possible to make a distinction between academic matters and political matters. The University had to learn to live with itself as a new political beast and had to learn also how to break the log-jam of its business. It was a question, he said, of learning to make political decisions and housekeeping decisions at the same time while the slow restructuring of the University took place, all of which must be done in a parliamentary way. Referring to what constituted an emergency, Professor Vogel said that the question of student housing in relation to the plight of Canadian Indians or hunger throughout the world was of much lesser importance.

Professor Trentman spoke briefly, and then Professor Bindra spoke on the subject of discipline and punishment. He said that punishment to be effective had to be early, immediate and massive. In brief, he did not feel that Senate itself any longer had an option for taking disciplinary action, and suggested that such action should be taken by the peers of those accused. On the question of expediting Senate's business, he agreed with the distinction made by Professor Vogel between housekeeping and long-range needs. He suggested that somebody like the Steering Committee might be asked to take over the day-to-day decisions on Senate's behalf with Senate itself giving primary attention to long-range policies.

117. MOTION THAT DISRUPTIONS WERE NOT JUSTIFIED

It was then MOVED by Mr. Brown, and seconded by Professor Metrakos, that the disruption of a Faculty meeting, of a meeting of a Committee of Senate, and of a meeting of the Board of Governors, as reported by the Principal to this meeting, was not justified in any of those cases. Mr. Brown added that the intention of his motion was to give direction to the debate and not in any way to limit or prejudge it.

Professor Frankel said he favoured the holding of a debate before a formal motion was put, and Mr. Grey said he felt the motion was premature.

Dean Frost spoke in support of Mr. Brown's motion. He referred to the answer Mr. Hajaly had given to Professor Bate's question in which Mr. Hajaly had said he believed violence was justified. Mr. Edel said he objected to the use of the word "violence", and this point was discussed by several members. Vice-Principal Oliver said there definitely had been violence at the disruption of the Governor's meeting inasmuch as people had been pushed around. Dean Frost asked how Mr. Hajaly would react if a meeting of his own Students' Council was disrupted, and on a point of privilege Mr. Hajaly rose to say that a meeting of the Students' Council had, in fact, been invaded this week by 200 students and that the Council had nonetheless continued with its business. Dean Frost concluded by saying that all acts of violence and disruption were wrong.

Professor Horowitz spoke of the causes Mr. Hajaly had given for the disruptions, and said he supported Professor Vogel's view that these concerns were not sufficient justification for disruption. He said he believed that Senate should say clearly had it disapproved of the disruptions which had occurred on January 24 and January 27.

Professor Frankel distinguished between objective and subjective factors of disruption, placing the log-jam of Senate business, and the endless debates, etc. in the first category. Subjective or conscious factors included the power-play put on by the small group of radical students. The use of violence, he said, could not be justified.

Mr. Foster referred to the points made by Professor Vogel, Professor Frankel and Dean Frost, and said that the students had taken action from a position of principle. He pointed out that Mr. Hajaly had said that disruption in this particular case had been justified.

He added that if one agreed with the goals of the people who took action, then the action was seen to be justified.

On a point of order, Professor Yaffe asked Mr. Foster whether what he was saying was that if the students got what they wanted, that was fine; but if they did not, then they were free to disrupt? The Principal ruled that this was not a proper point of order.

Mr. Foster went on to say that at the beginning of the year the student Senators had confidence in Senate, but that this had now been lost. The Governors had refused to consider questions, and there was no student representation on the Governors. Demands made by the Students' Society briefs had not been met; he concluded by saying that sometimes tactics of disruption were justified, and that open meetings and the creation of the Tripartite Commission had come about as a result of disruption. The problem was very simple, he stated, all people had to do was to agree with the demands and there would be no disruption.

Dean McGregor said he shared Mr. Hajaly's desire to return to the urgent business of Senate but that it was first necessary to decide priorities. He said that the bodies concerned should consider what the priorities were, and pointed out that a disrupted body was unable to do this or, indeed, to consider any issues. He said he felt that Senate should reaffirm its belief in the democratic process, and its belief in necessary measures to protect this process, and should then turn its attention to substantive issues. He said he was opposed to Mr. Brown's motion because it was asking Senate to judge past events.

Professor Waters said he believed that the orderly conduct of business was essential to the life of any institution. He said he agreed with the previous points made by Professor Malloch that it was essential for the role of Senate and Governors to be defined, and a decision made as to what their priorities should be. Once this decision was made, and the topics for discussion chosen and so accepted by the community, then disruption would be completely unjustified. A division would then be clear between those who accepted the democratic process and those who did not.

Mr. Hyman reviewed the events surrounding the disruptions which had occurred at the Faculty of Arts and Science meeting, at the meeting of the Nominating Committee, and at the meeting of the Board of Governors. In the first instance the aim of open meetings had since been accepted by the Faculty. He said that the Nominating Committee had not been disrupted since the meeting continued with a voluntary decision to adjourn. He said that the Board of Governors was not legitimate and had no democratic process. The Governors refused to discuss issues, and hence were acting contrary to the interests of those they were supposed to serve. He spoke further to these points, and said the reasons he had given showed the actions taken by the students to be justified.

Dean Cohen pointed out that Senate, at least, was structured according to the democratic process with student representation and with student views being heard. Senate provided the machinery for a forum in which all major interests could be heard, and he said he felt it was the obligation of all concerned to give this machinery a chance to operate. Senate was making a serious attempt to deal with issues, and he did not believe that there had been a sufficient degree of oppression to justify disruption. He cited the many issues the students had raised, and said that Senate had given serious attention to each of these. He referred to the special meeting on Senate's competence which was to be held on February 26 and said this would provide a further opportunity to discuss these issues. He spoke in more detail of actions which had been taken by Senate and the Board of Governors with regard to each of the issues raised by the students, and concluded by saying that there had not been a sufficient degree of oppression to justify the suspension of an existing democratic process. He

urged that all should maintain their faith in the democratic process.

Vice-Principal Oliver spoke of Mr. Grey's earlier statement that the mass of students was opposed to disruption and at the same time also opposed to those who tried to do something about it, saying he felt this displayed a grave state of alienation. He said he felt that the University must be in a receptive mood for change and think radically of ways of getting business done and issues discussed. He cited three propositions which had been made today: Mr. Hyman's, that if a tactic works then it is justified, Mr. Foster's, that disruption is justified if certain priorities were not respected, and Professor Bindra's, that sanctions were pointless. Combining these propositions seemed to make it impossible to handle the University in this transition period. What was necessary, he felt, was to preserve a doctrine of personal responsibility. Those who then chose to disrupt the democratic process would have to accept a judicial process which would determine whether or not there was extenuation. Professor Bindra said the point he had made was that Senate itself was incapable of imposing massive punishment, but that a method of discipline should be found through the use of peer groups.

Mr. Hajaly spoke against the assumption that the governing bodies of the University were democratic. On Senate the staff had four times as many elected representatives as had the students, and bearing in mind the respective numbers of each group, this meant that the staff had sixty times better representation than the students. At the beginning of the session the students had accepted this imbalance, hoping to persuade Senate to be more responsive and to increase the speed of change. All the proposals that had come to Senate, he pointed out, had been passed by the Students' Council. A division of interest now existed and the sixty-to-one ratio he had cited was important. Senate was undemocratic, he said, and student proposals had been defeated on many votes. As to the Board of Governors, he pointed out that they had never been elected and represented perhaps 2% of Quebec's population. No student had been present at the meeting of the Board of Governors to present a student motion. The situation here was clearly undemocratic.

Professor Horowitz referred to the disruption of the Nominating Committee meeting which had taken place on January 24, and asked Mr. Hajaly whether he believed the composition of the Nominating Committee to be democratic, saying that the students could have had much greater representation on the Nominating Committee had they so desired. Mr. Hajaly and Mr. Foster replied to this point, pointing out, as they had on previous occasions, that the Students' Council wished to retain for itself the nominating of students to Senate Committees. Mr. Foster said that students constituted eight out of sixty-two voting members of Senate, and they were not willing to have the Nominating Committee perpetuate that proportion. If the representation on Senate was balanced then they would be willing to participate in the work of the Nominating Committee.

Professor Hitschfeld referred to the disruption of the Faculty of Arts and Science meeting, saying that an important discussion on CEGEPs had been blocked. The disruption of the meeting of the Nominating Committee had delayed the reform movement. With reference to Senate's log-jam of business, he pointed out that at the first meeting with student members present a large number of motions had been tabled and this represented disruption of Senate's business. These disruptive tactics had resulted in the disruption of reform movements, and some actions had been taken not in order to get business done but in order to exacerbate the situation.

Professor Maître said that the views of some of the student Senators on democracy seemed to reject the qualities of fairness, reason and patience. He quoted from an article written by Mr. Foster in the *Daily* which said that at times other than normal channels must be used.

Professor Henry spoke in support of the points made by Dean Cohen and Professor Horowitz, saying she was opposed to violence on the campus. It was necessary, she felt, to examine the nature of the grievance. She said she supported adoption of Mr. Brown's motion, after which a careful examination of the grievances should be undertaken.

Professor Noumoff said that it would be premature and illogical to adopt a position from which penalties could be derived without first having considered the substantive issues. Reason and a democratic process were not ends in themselves. The University existed in a new environment, and the passing of resolutions concerning society affected its own environment even if this did not affect governments. He referred to the many notices of motions which had been given which had then been moved into the distance at the bottom of an agenda. In a rapidly accelerating situation he felt that issues must be confronted now.

Professor Noumoff, seconded by Professor Malloch, then MOVED that Mr. Brown's motion be tabled until after the special meeting of Senate which was to be held on February 26.

As seconder Professor Malloch spoke in favour of the motion, saying that Mr. Brown's motion at best represented a mother's day card and at worst a step towards sanctions. Further, if Mr. Brown's motion was defeated then in effect Senate would be saying that certain actions were justified. Mr. Grey said that between now and February 26 some check should be kept on the gang of thirty-five to fifty revolutionary students. He said that this action could not be postponed until February 26, and added that the people who controlled the Students' Council were acting in bad faith.

Mr. Brown referred to another element of the University community, namely the graduates, and said that the graduates, some 50,000 strong, were deeply interested and concerned in this issue. He said he believed that if Senate tabled the motion, saying in effect that the disruptions had been justified, Senate would become a laughing stock.

The motion to table was then voted upon and lost. Eight members voted in favour of the motion.

Discussion of the main motion was resumed. Mr. Edel said he was glad that these proceedings were on television since this was a typical Senate meeting. No positive action was being taken and no initiative was being shown on social needs. At the outset, he said, Mr. Hyman had suggested a constructive agenda which would enable Senate to turn its attention to these serious issues. He said he wished Senate to get on with a discussion of real needs, and then MOVED that the question be put.

This motion was voted upon, with twenty-eight members voting in favour, eighteen members voting against, and one abstaining. Lacking a two-thirds majority, the motion was lost.

Professor Anhalt then spoke on the general issue, saying he believed that obstruction by physical action was indefensible.

Professor Johnston said it would not be wise for Senate to pass the motion without a very lengthy discussion bearing in mind the spirit of the meeting and the good of the University. As an amendment to the motion Professor Johnston then MOVED that: "Senate, while believing that recent disruptions of various meetings have not been justified, resolves to continue its examination of the large issues before the University and appeals to all members of the University community to maintain a spirit of reason and good faith."

Professor Bindra seconded the motion. Professor Yaffe asked to have his name withdrawn from the list of those who had asked to speak and suggested that other members might wish to do the same.

Dean Frost, seconded by Professor Vogel, then MOVED that the question be put. This motion was carried, with three members dissenting.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, with one member dissenting.

The main motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried, with six members dissenting.

Dean Dion then MOVED that the meeting be terminated, and this motion was carried, with twelve members dissenting.

The meeting of Senate terminated at 12:55 p.m.

Senate minutes

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1969, AT 2:20 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL ROOM OF THE LEACOCK BUILDING.

118. ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETINGS

Before the adoption of the agenda had been moved, Professor Hitschfeld rose to say that the report of the Committee on the Implications of Open Meetings, which had been adopted by Senate at its meeting on September 11, 1968, ruled that the audience at Senate meetings should be limited to about 60, all of whom would be seated in the area beyond the main entrance and not in the area beyond the room's partition. He proposed that this rule should henceforth be adhered to.

Dean Frost then MOVED that the Steering Committee be requested to ensure that arrangements for meetings in the future should be according to the diagram submitted to Senate at its meeting on September 11.

Mr. Grey said that this change in the existing practice would create dissatisfaction, and that as large an audience as possible should be accommodated. Professor Johnston suggested the possible use of closed-circuit T.V.

Mr. Foster said he believed this to be a trivial point and MOVED that the question be put. This motion was carried by a vote of 27 to 4. The main motion was then voted upon, and carried by a vote of 22 to 13.

On a point of personal privilege, Professor Noumoff rose to suggest that the Steering Committee should also be asked to consider alternative places of meeting which would permit the accommodation of a larger audience. To cut the size of the existing audience by more than one half, he felt, would be totally counter-productive.

119. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Professor Johnston MOVED that the proposed agenda be adopted.

Mr. Hajaly referred to the resolution which had been adopted at the special meeting last Saturday, reading in part that Senate would "continue its examination of the large issues before the University," and said that as an example of such large issues the Radical Students' Alliance had a programme of major issues to present to the University. Mr. Hajaly, seconded by Mr. Hyman, then MOVED that a representative of the Radical Students' Alliance be allowed to present or read out the main elements of this programme.

Professor Johnston proposed that a member of Senate should be asked to read the statement, and Professor Hitschfeld suggested that it could be taken as read since it had already been published in today's issue of *The Daily*. Vice-Principal Oliver said that at a recent meeting Senators had agreed that no outside person would be permitted to speak unless Senate or the Steering Committee had approved such a proposal in advance. Mr. Hyman pointed out that this rule pertained only to persons from outside the University.

Dean Woods suggested that the question be referred to the Steering Committee. Mr. Grey said that although hearing the statement might be contrary to procedure it was wrong to worry about procedure, and that the demands presented by the Radical Students' Alliance were ridiculous in any event.

Professor Yaffe then MOVED as an amendment to the motion that the proposal be referred to the Steering Committee to be considered for assignment of a place on the agenda.

This amendment to the motion was carried, by a vote of 22 to 12.

The main motion to adopt the agenda, as amended, was then voted upon and carried by a vote of 22 to 2.

120. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE

At the Principal's request the Secretary read the following report of the Steering Committee:

1. *Approval by Senate of five-year parallel CEGEP programme:*

Assuming that Dawson College will definitely open in 1969, it is urgent that the University officially inform its public and applicants that the new Five-year programme will be in force. It is recommended, therefore, that a resolution to this effect by Vice-Principal Oliver be presented as the first item on the agenda.

2. *Recommendation by the Nominating Committee that its meetings be open:*

At its interrupted meeting on January 24, the Nominating Committee went on record as favouring open meetings in the future and of recommending to Senate that the existing rule (Report of the Committee on the Implications of Open Meetings) debarring this Committee from being open be changed accordingly. It is urgent for this Committee to proceed with its work, and it is recommended therefore that this item be placed third on the agenda, after the Motions on Quebec Education.

3. *Matters in report of the Faculty of Arts and Science:*

The Steering Committee reports that item B VI (a) the Report of the Faculty of Arts and Science with regard to a resolution on Computer Science and the establishment of a Department of Jewish Languages and Literatures has been removed from the agenda since these matters have been referred to the Committee on Academic Policy.

4. *Approval of key dates for the 1969-70 session:*

The Key Dates for the 1969-70 session, proposed by the Committee on Sessional Dates, were tabled at the last meeting. It is urgent to approve these so that they can be published in the General and Faculty Announcements. It is recommended, therefore, that these dates herewith be approved.

5. *Proposals by the Academic Policy Committee:*

a) In the fifty-fourth report, tabled on December 11, 1968, Senate was asked to approve the following two recommendations:

1. that an academic planning staff within the Office of Research for Planning and Development, responsible to the Academic Policy Committee through the Vice-Principal (Academic) be established to carry on such work as either the Committee or the Vice-Principal (Academic) may require.

2. that the current Academic Policy Committee act as a planning committee as well as a policy committee and that it be given budgetary information, reports prepared by the planning group and other such documents.

Believing that these are purely administrative matters, the Steering Committee reports for information that it has approved them on Senate's behalf.

b) The Academic Policy Committee proposed that a "Sub-Committee on the Structure of Multi-Disciplinary Studies" be established; and in order for this Sub-Committee to function, the Steering Committee recommends that the proposal be approved.

6. *Approval of minutes:*

It is recommended that the Minutes of the special meeting held on January 11, 1969, and the Minutes of the regular meeting held on January 22, 1969, now be approved, it being understood that discussion of business arising from these Minutes will take place in the usual order.

7. *Senate ratification—cancellation of a student's registration:*

The Steering Committee has considered in detail the name and full particulars surrounding the case of a student who gained admission by presenting false

qualifications. As an administrative decision, this student's registration was declared cancelled by the authority of the Principal; and the Steering Committee now recommends that in order to complete the record this action be ratified by Senate.

8. Special meeting to consider Senate's competence: The Steering Committee proposes that this special meeting, arising from the "Conference" proposed by Professor Noumoff and Professor Maitre, be held on Wednesday, February 26, at 7:00 p.m. The Committee further recommends that Professor Noumoff, Professor Maitre, and Mr. Ellis be appointed organizers of the meeting and asked to prepare position papers, list of proposed speakers, etc. and report back to the Steering Committee.

9. Conference on Quebec education: The Committee reports for information that it has appointed a sub-committee to consider and report on how and when this Conference should be held.

10. Statutory Selection Committee for a chair in mathematics:

It is recommended that this Committee be established, with Professor Rosenthal and Professor Hitschfeld as the Senate representatives.

11. Action on motions by Mr. Grey: The Committee has referred the following motion to the Honorary Degrees Committee, which also acts as a Convocation Committee:

I MOVE that starting in 1969 the following rules be observed in Convocations:

1. no formal mode of dress be prescribed;
2. speakers be chosen by a committee composed of a representative of the administration, a representative of the teaching staff, and a member of the Students' Society, and that unanimity be required for agreement.
3. no fine accompany failure to attend.

The Committee has referred the following two motions to the Committee of Deans:

1. I MOVE that 'late payment' and 'late registration' fees be waived if a reasonable excuse (e.g. absence from Montreal) be presented.
2. I MOVE that students who fail, or are put on reduced load be henceforth permitted to present their case personally to the Committee on Promotions and Standing if they choose to.

12. Motion by Professor Yaffe re "McGill Reporter": It is recommended that this motion, attached to the agenda, be considered under "Discussion of McGill Reporter" as listed on the agenda.

13. Illegal use of cameras and recording equipment at meetings of Senate:

The Steering Committee points out that the existing rule debarring the use of cameras and recording equipment was broken at the meeting on January 22, and recommends that the gallery be reminded of the rule.

14. New items on the agenda: It should be noted that several new items have been added at the bottom of the agenda.

The agenda change proposed in Article 1 was approved.

With regard to Article 2, the recommendation by the Nominating Committee that its meetings be open, Mr. Hajaly asked whether at that point of the agenda he could also raise the question of whether the Nominating Committee should name persons to serve on selection committees for Deans before that procedure had been revised. The Principal said that such discussion would be in order.

Article 3, concerning the report of the Faculty of Arts and Science, was approved.

With regard to Article 4, recommending approval of the Key Dates for the 1969-70 session, Mr. Foster pointed out it assumed that the University would not be working on a trimester system next session, and

for this reason MOVED, seconded by Mr. Hajaly, that the recommendation be tabled.

This motion was voted upon and was lost. Five members voted in its favour.

With regard to Article 5, the proposals by the Academic Policy Committee, Mr. Ellis said he did not believe the Steering Committee possessed authority to approve these proposals on Senate's behalf. It was then MOVED by Dean Frost, and seconded by Vice-Principal Oliver, that Senate approve the actions taken by the Committee.

Mr. Hajaly pointed out that these proposals had been a concern of the Joint Sub-Committee for more than a year, and to call them an administrative matter was being less than honest. This was a policy matter, he felt, which should be dealt with in its regular place on the agenda. As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Hajaly then MOVED that this matter be considered at its proper place in the agenda when the report of the Academic Policy Committee was presented.

As a comment, Professor Hitschfeld said that it was useful to have a Steering Committee which was willing to take action on Senate's behalf.

At this point the proceedings of Senate were interrupted. A student, who later identified himself as Mr. Allen Feingold, with other students and at least one member of staff grouped behind him, began to read out the document entitled "A Programme for McGill" which had been published in today's issue of the *Daily* by the Radical Students' Alliance. He refused to cease reading this article when asked to do so by the Chairman and individual members of Senate.

While this reading went on, Vice-Principal Oliver said that this interference was completely out of order, and MOVED that the gallery be cleared. This motion was carried, with five members dissenting.

The Principal said that he would entertain a motion to the effect that Senate adjourn for fifteen minutes while the galleries were being cleared. Professor Yaffe so MOVED, seconded by several Senators, and the motion was carried.

121. THE GALLERY CLEARED AND REOPENED The gallery having been cleared, Senate resumed its proceedings at 3:10 p.m.

Professor Yaffe said he believed all members of Senate would agree that this interruption had been disgraceful but not unexpected. He MOVED that Senate consider its meeting to have been disrupted for fifteen minutes.

Professor Metrakos said the disruption had been a fact, and hence why debate it. Dean Woods said that if the intention of the motion was simply to recognize the disruption, he would second it, and did so. Vice-Principal Oliver said he believed that a better motion would be that Senate deemed the interruption to constitute a disruption of University business. Professor Yaffe said this was the intention he had in mind.

Mr. Edel repeated what he had said at the special meeting on Saturday, that Senate was not democratic. Unless the meeting was declared open immediately he said that he would leave.

Mr. Ellis urged that Senate get on with its business, and MOVED that the question be put. This motion was carried unanimously. The main motion was then voted upon and carried unanimously.

At this point Mr. Edel and Mr. Foster left the meeting.

Professor Metrakos referred to the motion passed at the special meeting on Saturday which appealed to all members of the University community to maintain a spirit of reason and good faith, and said that this motion had been blatantly disregarded. He MOVED, therefore, that the students responsible for the disruption be disciplined.

Mr. Brown cautioned against this kind of motion, and Professor Yaffe suggested it be changed to read that Senate should recommend that disciplinary action be considered.

Mr. Grey then MOVED, seconded by Mr. Hyman, that the meeting be opened at this moment. He pointed out that if discussion of discipline was to take place this should not be conducted in secret.

In reply to a question from Professor Noumoff, the Principal ruled that Professor Metrakos's motion had not been seconded prior to the seconding of Mr. Grey's motion, and that hence Mr. Grey's motion took precedence.

Mr. Hyman, supported by Professor Hitschfeld and Dean Blume, said it was important for the press to be permitted to be present at all times.

Dean Woods said he was disturbed at the motion because there was no guarantee that similar disruption would not occur again. He expressed the hope that all members of Senate would react very quickly if the meeting was opened and any consequent interference resulted. The Chancellor said he was astonished at the motion and said it seemed to negate the purpose of clearing the gallery in the first place.

Dean Cohen urged that Senate should adopt a flexible attitude. All the members had a stake in the viability of Senate and he asked that all should share in the keeping of good order. Professor Henry said she had been shocked at the immediate appearance of a T.V. camera in the back of the room. Mr. Hyman replied to the point raised by Dean Cohen concerning moral responsibility and said that the students did not constitute a dictatorship in control of their members.

The motion to open the meeting was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 28 to 10. The meeting was then re-opened at 3:25 p.m.

122. STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT RESUMED Consideration of the Steering Committee report was resumed. Dean Frost reiterated his motion, with regard to Article 5, that the actions taken by the Steering Committee with regard to the proposals by the Academic Policy Committee be approved.

Vice-Principal Oliver said that although he had seconded Dean Frost's motion, he felt sympathy for the view expressed by Mr. Hajaly that these were not purely administrative matters, and said for this reason that he would abstain from voting. Mr. Hajaly repeated his view that a dangerous and improper precedent would be set.

Professor Hitschfeld suggested that the motion be adopted but the danger of setting a precedent be avoided. He distinguished between reversible and irreversible actions. Professor Noumoff proposed that the words "without precedent" be added to the motion, and that the Steering Committee be asked to report back to Senate on which matters it considered to be administrative in nature. Professor Bindra agreed with Professor Noumoff, adding that the Steering Committee had still under consideration the question of which matters should be considered administrative. He suggested that the wording of the motion be changed to read that the Steering Committee "recommends" that recommendations 1 and 2 of the Academic Policy Committee be approved.

Mr. Hajaly said he agreed that this decision might be reversible, but added that the same was true of most policy decisions. The present wording, he thought, was dangerous on what was clearly a policy matter.

This question was discussed at some length. Dean Frost, who had been in the Chair at that point of the meeting of the Steering Committee, said the Committee had felt that the matter had received very considerable discussion, had been widely approved, and that its implementation was purely an administrative matter. Mr. Hyman proposed that the Steering Committee be instructed in the future to make recommendations rather than to report on actions it had already taken. Mr. Hajaly agreed that the matter should only be brought forward as a recommendation, and then withdrew the Amendment to the motion he had moved previously.

Dean Woods pointed out that he and Professor Pavlasek served as a sub-committee of the Steering Committee which was at the moment considering specific points of this kind and urged that the hands of the Steering Committee should not be tied. He suggested that Senate should approve these two recommendations.

As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Hyman then MOVED that Senate accept the action of the Steering Committee, but that in future the Steering Committee be asked not to report actions taken but to make recommendations to Senate for its approval. Dean Frost seconded this amendment to the motion.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried.

Professor Leblond pointed out that there would be times when the Steering Committee would have to act on Senate's behalf and urged that Senate should give its trust to the Steering Committee.

With regard to Article 5 b), Vice-Principal Oliver pointed out that the authority of Senate was not needed to appoint the sub-committee in question.

On motion by Mr. Hyman, Article 6 recommending the approval of the Minutes of the special meeting held on January 11 and the Minutes of the regular meeting held on January 22 was adopted.

Dean Frost, seconded by Dean Solin, MOVED that Article 7, asking for Senate's ratification of the cancellation of a student's registration, be adopted.

In response to a question from Mr. Hyman, Dean Solin said that the student concerned had admitted full guilt in this matter, and added that he had assured the student that his anonymity would be preserved.

Mr. Grey asked a further question, and it was agreed that he should discuss this question in private with Dean Solin.

The motion that Senate should ratify the action taken was then approved.

With regard to Article 8, concerning the special meeting to consider Senate's competence, Professor Maitre said that he and Professor Noumoff and Mr. Ellis, the organizers of this special meeting, felt that a longer time than would be allowed by an evening meeting was required. He said that the organizers hoped that the Steering Committee would find it possible to change the time of its meeting for 3:00 p.m. on February 26. He then MOVED that the special meeting on February 26 should commence at 2:20 p.m. with a break for dinner at about 7:00 p.m., and the discussion continued after dinner until about 9:00 or 10:00 p.m.

This motion was carried.

Professor Maitre invited members of Senate to submit position papers to the organizing group. Professor Noumoff suggested that other persons in the University be invited to submit papers or to speak at the meeting, and proposed that the organizing committee be empowered to place on the agenda papers by persons who were not members of Senate.

In discussion, Professor Leblond urged that members of Senate should have first priority. Dean Frost made the point that the purpose of the meeting was to help Senate clear its own mind as to its role. He felt that many members of Senate would wish to speak and that this would not permit time for outside persons. He proposed that the speaker's list be limited to members of Senate. Professor Judkins suggested that a member of Senate could read a paper by an outside person, and Professor Wallace also supported the idea that outsiders should not be excluded.

The Chancellor pointed out that the longer and more frequent meetings of Senate were imposing limits on the amount of time available to professors. He said there was a danger that Senators would become professional administrators or legislators with insufficient time available for their academic work. He suggested that position papers should be circulated in advance of the special meeting. He suggested that no one should read anything, that all papers should be circulated, and that the discussion be started at once, and that it be confined to members of Senate. This statement was greeted with applause.

Professor Maitre pointed out that by previous decision of Senate, position papers from the Tripartite Commission on the Nature of the University were to be invited and that this Commission included student members.

Dean Woodssaid he definitely favoured the circulation of papers instead of their being read. Dean Cohen

made the point that it would be necessary to take a total look at the new competence of Senate, and that it would be premature to invite outsiders to participate, except for members of the Tripartite Commission who were not members of Senate. Mr. Ellis suggested that any outside viewpoints could be circulated together with the position papers.

At the conclusion of this discussion, the organizing committee was asked to bear in mind the various points made by members of Senate.

Article 9, concerning the proposed Conference on Quebec Education, was noted. It was added that the sub-committee appointed by the Steering Committee comprised:

Professor Johnston
Professor Horowitz
Mr. Hyman
Mr. Grey
Mr. Grimson

At the Principal's request, Professor Johnston agreed to act as convenor of the first meeting of this committee, it being agreed by Senate that the Committee should elect its own Chairman.

Dean Frost MOVED that Article 10, recommending the appointment of a statutory selection committee for a Chair in Mathematics, be adopted.

Mr. Hajaly pointed out that several meetings ago proposals concerning the selection of academic personnel had been tabled until a deadline of January 31 pending the reception of the report from the MAUT on this subject. He said that the Students' Society would have a report of its own on this subject ready next week and would bring it to Senate as soon as possible. He MOVED, therefore, that the recommendation to appoint a statutory selection committee be tabled until such time as Senate reached a decision concerning the selection of academic personnel.

Professor Yaffe said that it was urgent to appoint this committee and that no delay should be permitted. Mr. Hyman pointed out that the original proposals had been tabled until January 31 or until the MAUT report was presented. At that time Professor Yaffe had said that Senate could take action if no report was received by January 31.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and was lost. Six members voted in its favour.

Vice-Principal Oliver said he had voted against the amendment with regret since he was moved by the points made by the student Senators. His vote had been to prevent substantial injustice being done to individuals.

The Principal said he believed that the MAUT report was almost ready. Professor Bates said that the Senators from the Faculty of Medicine, including Mr. Caron, were working hard at the problem. It was a complex situation, and harm could be caused the University if delays occurred in the appointment of these committees. Dean Frost pointed out that the Statutes would have to be amended before a change in the composition of statutory selection committees could be made. Mr. Hyman suggested that student Senators could be appointed to these committees as a matter of equity. Mr. Grey said he thought it would be a mistake to adopt this course.

The Principal said he wished to speak to this subject, and Vice-Principal Winkler took the Chair.

The Principal said that the need to appoint committees to advise the Principal on the appointment of Deans was becoming more urgent with the passing of time. A mechanism had been adopted in one instance, which involved the advice of students, and which he was willing to propose for adoption in other instances. In the case of the appointment of a Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, he had asked the Dental Undergraduates' Society to send representatives to discuss the question with him. The group from the Dental Undergraduates' Society would also meet with the Senate Committee. As a pro-tem measure this seemed to be the only solution. He was bound to take advice from the Senate Committee, but was free to take advice from other quarters, and he proposed in

a similar way to invite students from other Faculties to advise him.

Mr. Hyman asked why the students should not be appointed as full members of the committee. He said he felt there should be the same number of students as there were Senators and that the committees should be structured on a tripartite basis. In reply to Mr. Hyman's question, the Principal said he was bound by the Statutes and could not appoint students as members of the Senate committee.

Dean Woods referred to arrangements which had been made in the Faculty of Arts and Science for the selection of a Vice-Dean. He had asked the ASUS to appoint a parallel student advisory committee which would meet with the Faculty committee. He pointed out that members of the teaching staff would not discuss their colleagues in front of students. The positions in question were not politically contested jobs, and it was important not to discourage candidates from allowing their names to be considered.

In response to a question from Mr. Hyman, the Principal said that Deans were appointed by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the Principal after consultation with a statutory selection committee. Mr. Hyman asked whether the decision of such a committee was binding, and the Principal said that technically he had power to disregard the advice of the committee.

Professor Johnston said he approved of the action proposed by the Principal, and wondered whether consultation should also take place with graduates.

Professor Hitschfeld said he wished to make the point he had made on previous occasions, that genuine academic advice was needed on selection committees. For this particular Chair in Mathematics, he was willing to serve in his capacity as Vice-Dean, but in addition to the Vice-Dean and the Chairman of the Department he felt that a professor of Mathematics should be added, and suggested Professor Pavlasek.

Professor Noumoff then MOVED Professor Hitschfeld's proposal as an amendment to the motion.

Mr. Brown then read an extract from the Statutes which stated clearly that there must be two Senate representatives on a statutory selection committee. Professor Noumoff asked for a ruling from the Chair whether Senate was prohibited from adding additional members. The Principal said this was a difficult matter since selection committees were at present constituted in a way that differed from the Statutes since they included Vice-Principals and the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research as ex officio members.

In the course of further discussion Professor Johnston suggested that the name of Professor Pavlasek be substituted for one of the others. Dean Woods urged that the recommendation be accepted in its present state, adding that outside advice was sought in any event. Professor Yates pointed out that Senate's only role was to appoint two Senate representatives.

After further discussion, the Principal, who had resumed the Chair, ruled that the amendment was out of order since it conflicted with the Statutes.

Finally, the motion to approve Article 10, and to appoint two Senate representatives to the statutory selection committee for a Chair in Mathematics, was voted upon and carried.

In response to a question from Mr. Hyman, the Principal said he would take legal advice on the question of the present composition of statutory selection committees.

Article 11, dealing with actions on motions by Mr. Grey, was noted. In response to a question from Mr. Hyman, Dean Frost said that the last two motions concerning special fees and promotions respectively had been referred to the Committee of Deans because this was an area in which Deans exercised their discretion. The second recommendation, he said, had been considered by the Steering Committee to be a matter of primary concern for the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Articles 12, 13 and 14 were duly noted.

123 VICE-PRINCIPAL SHAW'S STATEMENT ON THE ISSUES

On a point of privilege, Mr. Shaw referred to the debate at the special meeting on Saturday, February 1, concerning "the issues" and said that these required further clarification. He then presented the following documents.

The statement to the Senate meeting of Wednesday, February 5, 1969 on the subject of "the issues" [Published in the February 17 issue of the *Gazette*]

Mr. Shaw spoke briefly to the papers he had presented, and Professor Yaffe suggested that they be published in the *McGill Reporter*.

Mr. Hyman said that after two and a half hours of discussion Senate had dealt with no matters proposed by the students. He referred to Dean Woods's previous criticism of himself for his number of interventions, and said that he should not be the person to be attacked on this score.

124. FIVE-YEAR PARALLEL CEGEP PROGRAMME

At the Principal's request, Vice-Principal Oliver spoke on the second item of the agenda, the "Resolution by Vice-Principal Oliver re Approval of Five-year Parallel CEGEP Programme," saying that this was a misleading title since he did not intend to recommend approval of the programme.

Vice-Principal Oliver mentioned the document which Senate had previously considered entitled "McGill's position regarding CEGEPs", and reviewed all the events which had taken place during the course of negotiations with the Government. He then presented the following documents which explained in detail the present situation:

1. Letter to M. Yves Martin, dated January 30, 1969.
2. Telegram in reply from M. Martin.
3. Statement re CEGEP equivalent proposal.
4. Recommendation of the Committee on Collegial Studies.
5. Resolution of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Vice-Principal Oliver said that the Committee on Collegial Studies did not have available M. Martin's telegram of reply at the time it passed its resolution, and suggested therefore that Senate reach its present decision on the basis of the "Statement re CEGEP equivalent proposal" rather than on the resolution of the Committee on Collegial Studies. Vice-Principal Oliver, seconded by Professor Yates, then MOVED that this statement be approved in principle, and specifically that the paragraph on page 5 reading as follows be adopted:

"Senate therefore authorizes the Principal to make a final decision, by February 17, on the duration of the academic programmes that begin in the fall of 1969. It believes that his decision should be based on whether or not the Principal is satisfied that plans for the move of the Education Faculty are definite and that adequate assurances of academic autonomy and financial viability have been received from the Government. Senate emphasizes the construction of the new Education Building because it appears as a key step in an orderly and rapid development of the CEGEP network."

Dean Woods referred to the discussion which had taken place yesterday at the special meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and MOVED as an amendment to the motion that the following words be added at the end of the second sentence in the paragraph on page 5: "taking into account the resolution of the Arts and Science Faculty at its special meeting on February 4 with regard to the question of the one-generation transition period".

In discussion, Mr. Grey said it was important to preserve intellectual autonomy, and Vice-Principal Oliver read from the Minutes of a meeting of the Comité Mixte which seemed to satisfy this point.

Professor Noumoff said he was troubled not by the delegation of authority to the Principal but by the terms of reference given to him. He wondered what kind of

minimum assurances the Principal would need to make his decision. Vice-Principal Oliver reviewed the answers already given by the Government and outlined what he believed to be the additional assurances required.

The amendment to the motion, moved by Dean Woods, was then voted upon and carried.

Mr. Hamer suggested that, if the Principal did not reach a decision in the intervening period, the matter be brought back to Senate for its decision at the next regular meeting on February 19. As an amendment to the motion, he then MOVED that, if the necessary guarantees had not been given and accepted before February 19, that the matter be brought before Senate at that meeting.

This amendment to the motion was carried.

Mr. Ellis referred to the proposal for a West Island CEGEP on the Macdonald College campus, and said that this question had never been adequately discussed. Senate had not heard proposals concerning the future of the Macdonald College campus, including the possible establishment of a Faculty of Resource Development. It would be premature, he felt, to allow some of the present wording to remain in the statement. As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Ellis then MOVED that the sentence on page 3, "space and facilities at Macdonald could then be rented to a West Island CEGEP Corporation on a three-year lease" be deleted; in the fourth line on page 4 the word "a" be substituted for the word "the"; and that the words on page 6 "because it appears as a key step in an orderly and rapid development of the CEGEP network" be deleted from the end of the paragraph which had been moved for adoption.

Mr. Hajaly said he felt sympathy for Mr. Ellis's views, but suggested that the issue should not be debated now. As a sub-amendment to the motion he MOVED that the statement be received rather than approved. This would have the effect of deleting Mr. Ellis's amendment since a document which was received should not be amended.

Professor Widdop spoke in support of Mr. Ellis's proposed amendment. He agreed that the construction of a new Education building should not be linked to the need for a CEGEP network. The facilities for a CEGEP on the Macdonald College campus were scant, he said. He also deplored the proposal to charge fees for students undertaking a parallel CEGEP programme.

Dean Dion also supported the points made by Mr. Ellis, saying that the statement should not be circulated until these matters had been settled. He urged that the deletions in the statement proposed by Mr. Ellis be made.

The Principal pointed out that a delegation to Quebec, comprising Vice-Principal Dion, Dean Hall, and others had presented a position paper containing suggestions that negotiations for space on the Macdonald campus be considered.

Mr. Ellis asked that his motion and Mr. Hajaly's sub-amendment be considered separately.

Vice-Principal Oliver made the point that the statement on page 3 objected to by Mr. Ellis was merely an historical account of what had happened. The three-year lease arrangement was part of the University's negotiating position.

Mr. Hajaly said he too had objections to parts of the statement and the intention of his sub-amendment was to avoid a full discussion of the objections that both he and Mr. Ellis held.

Vice-Principal Oliver urged that the University should not back down on its own proposal. An offer had been made to the Government, which included the three-year lease arrangement. If this offer was rescinded the University's bargaining position would be lost. The Principal added that the University might be put in the position of saying that it could not get guarantees from the Government when at the same time it could not give guarantees itself.

Professor Yaffe said that the document in general represented the McGill position, and suggested that

the sub-amendment be voted on. Professor Noumoff said he agreed that the statement should only be received.

The sub-amendment was then voted upon and carried, with two members dissenting.

As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Ellis then MOVED that Senate should not approve at this time the use of the Macdonald College campus as the site for a CEGEP institution. Professor Noumoff seconded the amendment to the motion.

The Principal summarized the position Senate had reached.

Professor Hitschfeld spoke to the main motion, saying that the possible abandonment of the five-year programme was a very serious matter, and that the University's stand should be put in the most positive light for the public. Senate, he felt, should express regret for any possible damage done to Dawson College.

In response to a question from Professor Vogel, Vice-Principal Oliver gave the Government's reason for insisting on fees for students in parallel CEGEP programme.

In order to have the main motion voted upon, after which Mr. Ellis's amendment could be considered, Mr. Hyman MOVED that all pending questions be put, and this motion was carried.

The main motion, as so far amended, was then voted upon and carried.

In discussion of Mr. Ellis's motion, Vice-Principal Oliver said no one had proposed that Macdonald College necessarily be the site of the West Island CEGEP. Mr. Hyman said that Mr. Ellis maintained the University had not yet reached a position on this matter, whereas Vice-Principal Oliver said that the University had made an offer to the Government. He suggested that the issue be decided here and now.

In reply to a question from Professor Leblond, Mr. Ellis said it would be inadvisable for the University to agree to any rental proposal. Dean Dion supported this point by Mr. Ellis, saying that no approval should be given by implication. No request had yet been received by Macdonald College and hence there should be no pre-judgement of the matter. Professor Wildop again expressed his concern over the Government proposal concerning parallel CEGEP instruction.

Vice-Principal Winkler took the Chair to allow the Principal to speak on the subject. The Principal said there had been much more than one administrative officer bargaining with the Government without the authority of Senate as had been suggested. A group of the chief officers concerned in the University had visited Quebec and had presented a paper. The negotiations had been reported back to Senate which had received the report and encouraged the negotiators to continue. Progress since then had been made according to these first negotiations. The Principal proposed that a group should be formed to consider the problem and give advice to him and to Senate before the meeting on February 19.

The Principal then MOVED as an amendment to Mr. Ellis's motion that an Advisory Committee now be formed, comprising the following:

Four representatives from Macdonald College, namely Vice-Principal Dion, Professor Neilson, Professor Warkentin, and Mr. Ellis;

Four members of Senate, namely Dean Frost, Professor Orvig, Professor Yates and Mr. Hyman; with Vice-Principal Winkler as Chairman.

In discussion of the motion, Vice-Principal Oliver read from the first document submitted to Senate which said that final approval by Senate and the Board of Governors would be necessary. The crucial thing, he said, was that the matter had been reported back to Senate and Senate had welcomed the progress of the negotiations. It would be most embarrassing if the negotiating position should now be abandoned. He said he welcomed the idea of the appointment of a committee proposed by the Principal, but added that negotiations should not be slowed up or halted.

Mr. Shaw made the point that Senate was losing

sight of the purpose of the negotiations, which at the outset had been an effort by McGill to respond to the needs of Quebec education. The delegation to Quebec had made it clear that it could not commit the University but had made certain proposals. Professor Leblond said that the hands of the University's negotiators must be free, and at the same time the Principal must be armed with authority to decide.

Dean Solin said he wondered what the effect would be if the Government met all the University's requirements before February 19 and we were not sure of our own position. Dean Cohen said he believed previous comments by Mr. Hyman to be correct, that if the Government accepts the University's proposals we would then have a commitment. Professor Neilson suggested that it might be premature to feel concern since the Government had not yet even surveyed the Macdonald campus with regard to its needs, and said she thought the negotiations should continue.

Mr. Hyman said he believed the appointment of an advisory committee was irrelevant, and **MOVED** that the motion be tabled. This motion was carried, by a vote of 24 to 4.

Mr. Hyman **MOVED**, seconded by Dean Frost, that the "Proposal regarding the future location of the Faculty of Education and the location of a West Island CEGEP", of November 8, 1968, including the proposal for a three-year lease, be accepted as the University's position.

Professor Yaffe **MOVED** that the question be put, and this motion was carried by a vote of 23 to 8.

Mr. Hyman's motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 28 to 4.

Vice-Principal Oliver **MOVED** that the advisory committee proposed by the Principal be appointed. Mr. Grey **MOVED** that the question be put, and this motion was carried.

The motion was then voted upon and carried unanimously.

125. OPENNESS OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Professor Leblond, seconded by Professor Yaffe, **MOVED** that the question of the openness of meetings of the Nominating Committee be considered next on the agenda with a twenty minute time limit for discussion.

Professor Vogel said he would be opposed to this motion unless the motions on Quebec Education were also considered.

Professor Bindra pointed out that the Nominating Committee could meet under its former rules and that its business could be proceeded with thereby.

Mr. Grey proposed, as an amendment to the motion, that the next two items on the agenda be considered with a forty minute time limit, but received no seconder.

Mr. Brown **MOVED** that the question be put, and this motion was carried, with one member dissenting.

Mr. Hajaly referred to his request earlier in the meeting that discussion concerning the selection of Deans should take place at the same time as the discussion of the Nominating Committee and asked that this aspect of the matter be held over for consideration at the next meeting.

The motion to move the question of the Nominating Committee from third to second place on the agenda was then voted upon and carried, with five members dissenting.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Brown that Senate immediately reconsider its decision of November 11 debarring the Nominating Committee from holding open meetings, and that notice of this motion be waived.

Mr. Hyman and Mr. Hajaly said that under Robert's *Rules of Procedure* there was no need for a motion to reconsider, and Mr. Brown replied that the existing Standing Rules of Procedure so stipulated. Mr. Brown's motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 27 to 3.

It was then **MOVED** by Dean Frost, seconded by Vice-Principal Oliver, that in reconsidering this question Senate should reaffirm its former position that

meetings of the Nominating Committee should be closed.

Mr. Hyman said that at the last meeting of the Nominating Committee the matter had been thoroughly debated, with each member present giving his views, and by a vote of 6 to 4 the Committee had decided to recommend to Senate that its meetings should be open. He urged that discussions concerning the selection of Deans should be open. Matters such as this, he said, were determining the orientation of the University, and should not be done in secret. He referred to experience in the Student Council when candidates for appointment had been present and had heard their qualifications discussed. To this point, Dean Frost replied that these were candidates who had applied for a job and not possible candidates who might be reluctant to serve.

Professor Maitre supported the points previously made by Dean Frost, saying that the vote of the Nominating Committee had been taken after a disruption. Mr. Grey said he believed that candidates for appointment and those discussing the candidates should have some measure of protection. He wondered whether a compromise plan could be worked out whereby some meetings would be open and some closed.

Professor Bindra said that the openness of meetings had become a strong issue, and added that nominations could always be challenged in Senate. As an amendment to the motion he **MOVED** that the decision concerning openness should be left to the Committee itself to decide. Mr. Hyman seconded the motion.

Professor Yaffe said he felt this amendment to be out of order since Senate would be reversing its own decision. He added that this was clearly a Senate matter which should be faced up to. The members of the Nominating Committee had been under duress at their last meeting, he said, and had been subject to power politics.

Dean Dion said that if he had been present at the last meeting of the Nominating Committee he would have voted against the proposal to open its meetings. Dean Blume spoke in support of the motion.

Professor Henry said there had been no duress at the meeting in question. She said she did not believe that the Nominating Committee should be concerned with personalities but should deal with people at a professional level. She felt also that candidates should be asked first whether they were willing to stand for nomination.

Dean Woods spoke against the amendment, saying it would be a major disaster for the meetings of the Nominating Committee to be open. Experience with student organizations, he said, was not valid since they dealt with job applicants. The consideration of personalities did form part of the Nominating Committee's work, and a decision to open the meetings of this committee should properly be discussed with the MAUT and members of the staff first.

Vice-Principal Oliver expressed his agreement with Dean Woods, and Dean Blume then **MOVED** that the question be put. This motion was carried by a vote of 25 to 2.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and lost. Four members voted in its favour.

Professor Yates pointed out that the time limit for this debate had already been exceeded, and Vice-Principal Oliver proposed that the next two speakers be heard and that the question then be put.

In continuation of the discussion, Professor Vogel said he did not believe there had been duress at the last meeting of the Nominating Committee. He said that if the meetings of the Nominating Committee were closed, nominations would then be questioned in Senate with additions and subtractions being made. He added that if the Nominating Committee remained closed there would be pressure to make open the meetings of selection committees, and this he did not favour.

Mr. Hajaly said that students had become more conscious of the use of power, especially with regard to committees that appointed persons, and spoke

against the motion because of the mistrust it would engender.

Professor Anhalt also said there had been no duress at the last meeting of the Nominating Committee, but added that he had second thoughts on this subject. He agreed with Dean Woods that safeguards to protect the privacy of the individual should be adopted. He referred to section 7 on page 8 of the report of the Committee on the Implications of Open Meetings dealing with the case of the University Scholarships Committee where individual names and cases were considered in a sub-committee. As an amendment to the motion he then **MOVED** that while the Nominating Committee as a whole should be open, all personal matters should be dealt with by a sub-committee, similar in function to that of the University Scholarships Committee, and that only policy matters be discussed in the full Committee. Mr. Grey seconded this amendment to the motion.

Mr. Hyman again said that he did not consider the question of personalities to be relevant, and in response to his question, Professor Anhalt said that if the amendment was approved the Committee itself would have to decide whether personalities should be discussed in full committee or in sub-committee.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and was lost. Nine members voted in its favour.

Mr. Brown then **MOVED** that the question on the main motion be put, and this motion was carried by a vote of 23 to 2.

The main motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 20 to 9. It was established that a quorum was still present.

It was **MOVED** that the meeting be terminated, and this motion was carried.

The meeting of Senate was terminated at 7:30 p.m.

Academic announcements

Notice re future meetings of Senate

By decision of Senate the size of the gallery henceforth will be limited and the proceedings will be shown on closed-circuit television.

This means there will be 65 tickets only available for admission to Senate and they will be given out on a first-come-first-served basis to students and staff commencing at 10:00 a.m. in the Registrar's Office on the day that Senate meets. Staff tickets no longer will be available from Deans' offices.

Televising of the proceedings may be viewed in Room C104 of the Macdonald Chemistry Building, unless otherwise notified. No tickets are required for admission to the T.V. viewing room.

17 February 1969

C.M. McDougall, Registrar

Lectures for high school students

The following is the balance of the schedule of the 1968-69 High School Lectures:

March 8

FOREIGN LANGUAGES—THE KEY TO INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Dr. J. G. Nicholson, chairman, Department of Russian Lecture chaired by Professor P. Maxwell

March 22

THE HOUSE THAT ECOLOGY BUILT

Dr. P. G. Holland, Department of Geography Lecture chaired by Professor Maxwell Dunbar

April 5

MINING AND THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

Dr. F. T. M. White, chairman, Department of Mining Engineering

Lecture chaired by Professor Stewart Marshall

Further details of the Lectures may be obtained from Miss Beswick, local 8084.

Continuing the descent

A REPORT ON THE ACTIONS OF SENATE AT ITS MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19.

The Gazette is intended to provide an objective factual account of proceedings of meetings and other events. The following account is far from that because we feel the nature of the meeting permits no other kind of reporting. Editor.

For Senate the route since October, when its new composition came into effect and open meetings were begun, has been all down hill. The unhappy evidence is that members of Senate have steadily moved toward total incapacity to deal with any issue that is of a controversial nature in a reasoned manner. Wednesday's meeting is unmatched for its expressions of rudeness and vitriol. The university community can only hope that after this sorry spectacle Senate has reached the foot of the precipice and at its special session this Wednesday will begin an ascent.

To express their displeasure with Senate, six of the student members (Robert Hajaly, Ian Hyman, Nigel Hamer, Paul Caron, Harry Edel and Peter Foster) called a press conference following the meeting to announce their dissociation from the business of Senate until such time as "Senate shows its willingness to debate and take action on the issues before the university." This does not mean, however, that the senators have immediate plans for resigning or withdrawing from Senate. They indicated that they will be discussing their future relationships with Senate at a meeting of Students' Council.

Stanley Gray took the opportunity to outline his response to the Principal's letter notifying him of the charges against him. (Mr. Gray presents his position in an article which appears on page 1 of this week's Reporter.)

In terms of concrete action little space is required to report on the Wednesday meeting. The fact is that it never did get around to considering its agenda for the day.

What it did do can be summarized as follows:

1. Approved a resolution presented by Dean E. G. Jay of the Faculty of Divinity concerning the recent death of Professor H. H. Walsh who retired from the faculty last summer.

2. Arising from a point of personal privilege Senate censured one of its members, Peter Foster, for what it termed an "unjustified and inflammatory" reference in the Monday, February 17 issue of the *McGill Daily* to Dean H. D. Woods as an "unscrupulous liar".

3. Agreed to hold a special session of Senate on March 12 to consider questions pertaining to Quebec education and ruled that no items concerning this general subject will be discussed at Senate until after that meeting takes place. This action effectively cancels an earlier decision by Senate to hold a campus wide discussion of the issues.

4. Refused after much debate to give Stanley Gray, lecturer in Political Science, an opportunity to lodge an appeal to Senate under the provision of the McGill University Statutes arising from the Principal's recommendation that he be dismissed from the University. It was determined that the appeal was based on a faulty interpretation of those statutes.

5. Defeated a motion that Senate recommend to the Principal that the charges against Mr. Gray be dropped.

6. Passed a motion that Senate expresses its confidence in the C.A.U.T. procedures and its confidence in the Principal to use these procedures in the case of Stanley Gray.

7. Refused to consider a motion that Senate dissociate itself from a statement by the Principal during the televised "settlement discussions" with Mr. Gray concerning reference to the South African legislature by passing an amendment that the motion was irrelevant.

For the record

BY R. F. SHAW, VICE-PRINCIPAL Administration.

For some time now, the campus has been assailed by protestations that the University's governing bodies were failing to deal with the issues and problems of concern to students. A great many questions were raised in the meetings on February 13, 14 and 17, held to attempt to reach an agreement with Stanley Gray, which were seen on closed circuit television.

As it was not the specific purpose of these meetings to deal with the issues, it might be useful, at this point, to consider some of the more important topics raised and, for the record, to place them in their actual context. Following is an itemized treatment of the student statements of "The Issues" together with an explanatory "Comment".

Student housing

The Issue: On November 25, 1968, the Board of Governors passed a motion stating that University funds can be better employed elsewhere and, therefore, it was not recommended that University funds be used to finance Student Housing project.

Comment: The Students' Council is well aware that the reason for recommending against the use of University funds is the fact that financing is available elsewhere; therefore, in these times of precarious University financing, endowment funds should be retained for projects or deficits which cannot be otherwise financed. The charge also fails to mention that the Board had offered a loan of \$500,000, subject only to the students' ability to obtain the necessary approvals and the Administration has supported every effort to obtain such approvals.

The Issue: On January 9, 1969, the students had spoken to Vice-Principal Shaw, who is also a member of the Board, regarding an option they had on a site back of the Union, and Mr. Shaw refused to even share the option money on this Peel Street site, much less give the full loan that was necessary to construct the co-op.

Comment: Mr. Shaw is not a member of the Board, but he has taken positive steps in these matters. At the request of the Students' Council, made on November 12, 1968, he placed before the Board of Governors on November 25, 1968 the question of the housing project and he obtained approval and support for the project.

One of the demands shouted from the spectators at the disrupted Board of Governors' meeting of January 27, 1969, was that student housing be placed on the agenda. It must be pointed out that this item was already on the agenda, that Mr. Shaw had prepared a report on the subject for the Board of Governors, that he had submitted a draft of this report to Mr. Hajaly, that he had made alterations and corrections at the suggestion of Mr. Hajaly. A copy of this report was finally submitted to the Executive Committee of the Board on January 29, 1969, and Mr. Shaw subsequently presented a statement to Senate of February 5, 1969 (McGill Reporter, Gazette section 17 February, 1969).

An examination of this statement will show that it is a requirement of the Department of Education that all projects undertaken by the University community must receive the prior approval of the Department regardless of the source of funds. The Department takes the attitude that if any funds are expended prior to receipt of this approval, then the project is not considered for any government support thereafter.

Mr. Shaw's refusal to share the cost of picking up the option in the amount of \$2,500 was based, therefore, on his judgment that such action would jeop-

ardize the University's position in this project and the amount of money involved was obviously within the financial capacity of the Students' Society. Furthermore, Mr. Shaw had advised the student representatives of this situation prior to the option date, and had urged them to pick up the option themselves.

The Issue: In January 11, 1969, the students presented a motion requesting Senate to urge the Board to approve the allocation of funds as a loan to the student co-op housing project. The Senate refused to pass this motion.

Comment: Senate, well aware that the Board of Governors had already done everything possible in the matter of student housing, as described above, nevertheless passed a motion at its meeting of January 11, 1969, recommending "to the Board of Governors that student housing be given high priority and that everything possible be done to facilitate the construction of the Students' Society proposed high-rise co-operative residence".

Faculty of management

The Issue: The Faculty of Management is to get a \$7,000,000 building of which \$2,000,000 was to come from the Board of Governors.

Comment: This is inaccurate. The Faculty of Management building is estimated to cost approximately \$4,000,000 — none of which is to be drawn from University endowment funds.

The Issue: The Sherbrooke Street site being considered for the location of the Faculty of Management building should be used for the site of a student residence.

Comment: This notion has not been submitted to the Development Committee, to the Senate through its Secretary, or the Board of Governors. It should also be made clear that other suitable sites are available. It seems surprising that students should wish to place the residence on University property when they have been demanding complete independence from both the University and the Provincial Government, except for assistance in financing the project.

The Issue: The Faculty of Management should be abolished and replaced by a school for training labour leaders.

Comment: This demand is in contradiction of a resolution passed by the Students' Council February 4, 1969, and in any event, it has not been submitted to the Secretary of Senate for inclusion on the agenda. It must also be pointed out to the University community that McGill, Université de Montréal and the Canadian Labour Congress have been co-sponsors of the Labour College of Canada on the McGill campus since 1961.

Bilingual McGill

The Issue: McGill University should be made bilingual by 1972.

Comment: A rapid increase in bilingualism is already a policy of the University. The Academic Policy committee has set up a subcommittee to study the increased use of the French language at the University. For many years, the University has offered the option of French for examinations, term papers and theses. The recent expansion of the Translation Service, presently situated in the Information Office, reflects the increasing use of French in documentation and correspondence. In the Faculty of Law, as

well as other faculties, there are courses and class discussions given in French.

Quebec education

The Issue: Senate has delayed student motions on Quebec Education from October 31, 1968 to January 11, 1969 when they were tabled, untabled and only partially dealt with.

Comment: This argument does not take into account that very similar motions presented by the Students' Council to a special meeting of Senate October 18, 1968, had been passed, although they were amended by the removal of specific details and redrafted in more general terms as the details were felt to be beyond the competence, knowledge and right of the University. The motions now being debated are, in general, a further expansion of these same subjects and again Senate has questioned whether it has the detailed knowledge and the right to rule on some of the questions raised by the motions.

The point must be made that when these motions came once more before Senate at its meeting of January 11, 1969, Senate recognized the importance of a full-scale review of the problems of Quebec education and authorized the Steering Committee to make arrangements for a Conference on Quebec Education. This Conference, with the participation of every sector of the University community, is to be held in March and it has as one of its tasks the formulation of specific policy recommendations to Senate. It is now proposed that this Conference take the form of a special meeting of Senate on March 12; and that Senate take decisions on the resolutions and motions arising from this meeting, at its regular meeting March 19, 1969.

The Issue: On January 22, 1969, Senate spent more time objecting to consideration of a student motion regarding the Teachers' strike than it would have taken for Senate to actually consider the motion.

Comment: It is true that Senate rejected this motion: they did not feel that the University could take sides in any conflict when its knowledge of details was limited and when it was in possession of incomplete facts about the negotiations between the parties. It should also be noted that this motion was "sprung" on Senate without notice. A long debate occurred over the fact that on two occasions, students had invited outsiders to address the Senate and one of them actually appeared, although neither the Chairman nor the Secretary had been consulted before the invitations were issued. The long debate arose from the fact that Senate believed this practice should be discontinued. In the event, Senate did agree to hear the men invited in on both occasions.

Research information

The Issue: In August the Students' Council sent to the Senate Committee on the Communication of Information a request to make available information concerning the financing of research. This was rejected by the Committee.

Comment: This report is true as far as it goes but it fails to mention that at its meeting of November 4, 1968, when the subject was brought before the Committee, members were informed of the fact that the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research had already undertaken the publication of a Research Guide and the Chairman of the Committee suggested that the matters raised by the students be brought forward again immediately following the appearance of this publication.

The matter was accordingly raised again shortly after the Research Guide appeared, at the meeting of the Committee on January 29, 1969, and it has been carried over as the first item on the agenda for the next meeting. The Chairman of the Committee and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research have been attempting to find an acceptable formula with the student representatives. There is no basic objection to the publishing of this research information.

Grading system

The Issue: On January 11, 1969, the students raised the question of the pass-fail system and instead of solving the matter then and there, the question was referred to the Academic Policy Committee.

Comment: This statement suggests that there is something improper in Senate's disposition of this matter. It is, on the contrary, quite proper that Senate would refer the problem to its Committee; obviously, such a matter could not be dealt with by Senate without Committee guidance. It might also be appropriate to point out that the Academic Policy Committee was instructed to report back on this matter by March 15, 1969. The Committee's responsibility in this matter is "to re-evaluate and prepare a report on the effect of the present patterns of evaluation of students' progress, examinations and grading and to propose possible alternatives to them".

Centre for developing area studies

The Issue: This Centre should be abolished and replaced by a Centre to study and report on the third world liberation movement and other Institutes should be transformed into Centres that will serve more clearly the interests of the people.

Comment: These items have not been submitted to the Secretary of Senate for inclusion on the agenda, and the meaning of these requests is not clear.

LIBRARY

The Issue: The Library should be open to the public twenty-four hours a day.

Comment: This matter has not been submitted to the Secretary of Senate for inclusion on the agenda. If this proposal is to be taken seriously, attention must be given to the ramifications of budget, and space limitations from the point of view of student and staff use of the resources.

Discipline

The Issue: The University-wide discipline code proposed by the students during the summer and considered by all to be of high priority and placed on the agenda of Senate October 31, 1968, has still not been discussed.

Comment: This statement fails to mention that the policy of a University-wide code applicable to all sections of the University community and included in the student resolution now pending was actually approved by Senate on September 11, 1968. It also fails to mention that an interim procedure pending the redrafting of the code was set up by Senate on October 31, 1968. It also fails to mention that the

redrafting must be done by Governors, Senators and students and that it was in-appropriate to set up the drafting committee until both the Senate and Board of Governors had been reconstituted in line with the University's policy of orderly democratization. The reconstituted Board of Governors has only had time to call one meeting, on January 27, 1969, and this meeting had to be terminated following disruption.

Democratization

The Issue: On November 11, 1968, the students brought forward a motion regarding the selection of Deans. This was defeated.

Comment: This motion referred to the Selection Committee for the Dean of Dentistry. It was defeated pending further study and a decision by Senate on overall policy. It must be mentioned that certain other Selection Committees for Deans were also presented, but the student Senators advised that they would raise no objections in the light of the need for a broad policy and on the understanding that the business of the University must continue, pending a solution. It must also be mentioned that, in fact, students are being consulted with respect to the selection of deans.

The Issue: On December 4, 1968, the students brought forward a motion regarding the selection of staff, and when this was finally discussed on December 18, 1968, it was tabled.

Comment: The term "finally" relates to the delay from December 4 to December 18. The comment fails to mention that the matter was tabled pending a recommendation from the McGill Association of University Teachers, which it was hoped would be ready by the end of January, 1969.

The Issue: In terms of the numbers of students, faculty and administration on the campus, students are under-represented on Senate by a factor of something like one to 120, and elected staff in themselves are over-represented with respect to students by a factor of 60 to one.

Comment: A university is made up of a community of scholars. If we are to maintain academic integrity, then the method, content, quality and quantity of teaching must be guided by informed professional judgment rather than by statistical judgment. If representation at all levels of university government is to be in proportion to the student-faculty population ratio, then there is danger that academic integrity will disappear.

A critical university

The Issue: On November 20, 1968, the students brought before Senate a "Critical University" motion which was defeated.

Comment: Senate did indeed pass an amended motion which reads as follows:

"Be it resolved that the Senate of McGill, conscious of the opportunity afforded by the introduction of CEGEP education, places itself on record in favour of a comprehensive review of those years retained by this University with a view toward establishing a critical intellectual environment permitting the McGill community to positively challenge all ideas and values".

Student political refugees

The Issue: The question of McGill making places available to U.S. students who are escaping from the United States as political refugees was on the agenda October 31, 1968 and it still has not been discussed.

Comment: It is true that this matter is still pending. When it does come up, the University will have to be concerned with creating a precedent which will oblige it to accept all students from every country who are in disagreement with their governments.

Open Meetings

The Issue: On October 31, 1968, the students proposed a number of changes to the Report on the Implications of Open Meetings. This still has not been discussed, three and a half months later.

Comment: The procedures for open meetings had been adopted by Senate September 11, 1968, before the open meetings were instituted and the student proposals are in fact suggested changes to these procedures. In addition, to the student proposals, various suggestions on procedures by members of the staff also remain to be considered. Again, this is due to the Senate backlog, but the changes do not suggest great urgency.

The Reporter

The Issue: Students had some proposals regarding The Reporter. They put the item on the agenda of Senate on October 31, 1968. It came up on January 11, 1969, but was postponed because certain key people did not show up.

Comment: There is no student motion recorded in the Minutes of the October 31 meeting of Senate. It was Professor Yaffe who said at this meeting that he wished to enter an item concerning the operation of The McGill Reporter. While this item is still on the agenda, it has been made clear that Professor Yaffe's motion deals with advertising in The Reporter.

It must be pointed out that the Standing Committee on Communications, which has responsibility for the operation of The Reporter, on Senate's behalf, and which has three student members, has dealt with questions and motions posed by the students without any apparent difficulty. In fact, the present publication of the weekly Gazette section of The Reporter is the result of a student motion passed at the Committee's meeting of January 29, 1969.

Nominating Committee

The Issue: A number of people went to the Nominating Committee meeting on January 31, 1969, which they later allowed to proceed because it was meeting in confidential session. Thereafter, the Nominating Committee recommended to Senate that it should hold open meetings and on February 5, 1969, Senate rejected this recommendation and decided the Nominating Committee should continue in closed session.

Comment: This is true. Senate makes decisions on the recommendations of Senate Committees. It is not obliged to accept the recommendations of its Committees.

Board of Governors

The Issue: The Student's Society has recommended a radical revision of the Board of Governors so that it would include a large number of Senators (12 was suggested) and something like 15 people from the outside community representing labour, commerce, professions, research council, teachers' associations, student unions and the Superior Council of Education. This was refused and only a minor change in the composition of the Board was made. A membership committee was supposed to be set up to change the composition of the Board. This has not yet been done.

Comment: The first change in the Board of Governors in the process of democratization, already effected, was the addition of five Governors elected from Senate. The membership committee to consider the change in the composition of the Board was to consist of three Senators, elected by Senate and three Governors.

On November 25, 1968, the Board of Governors approved its representatives on this membership committee and the Secretary of Senate was so notified. To date, the three Senate members for this committee have not been named due, no doubt, to the large backlog of Senate business. The Membership Committee has in its terms of reference, the responsibility to seek out nominees to membership of the Board, "representative of the various parts of the Community which the University serves such as agencies of government, research, the professions, business, labour and the Arts."

The Issue: The Board of Governors has no student on it to present student motions and nobody else will put material on the agendas.

Comments: It must be recalled that student Senators may submit items to the Board of Governors, through Senate. In any event, the student brief on housing was presented to the administration on November 12, 1968. A submission to the Board of Governors was prepared by the administration and the chairman of the Student Housing Committee. This was presented to the Board on November 25, 1968, and it was passed.

Conclusion

It is true that in recent months the processes of University government have been slow as the University undergoes the necessary adjustments to reconstituted structures. The processes must somehow be streamlined but they must also provide for thoughtful debate. There have been delays caused by both student and staff representatives, complicated by delays due to disruption of meetings. In spite of this, only 14 of some 84 motions introduced by the student Senators are still pending. Governors, Senators and Committee members are continuing to process the day-to-day business of the University while giving thoughtful consideration to the long-term issues.